U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
White River Field Office
73544 Hwy 64
Meeker, CO 81641

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

NUMBER: CO-110-2005-139-EA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER (optional): COC68671

PROJECT NAME: Extra Work Space

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Sixth Principal Meridian, Colorado

T. 1 N., R. 101 W.,
Sec. 4, 5, 8
T. 2 N., R. 99 W.,
Sec., 2
T. 2 N., R. 100 W.,
Sec. 2, 7, 8, 9, 12
T. 2 N., R. 101 W.,
Sec., 18, 22, 33
T. 2 N., R. 103 W.,
Sec., 22, 25
T. 2 S., R. 100 W.,
Sec., 9
T. 2 S., R. 101 W.,
Sec., 7, 9, 16, 32
T. 2 S., R. 102 W.,
Sec. 35
T. 3 S., R. 102 W.,
Sec., 13, 25
T. 3 S., R. 101 W.,
Sec., 5, 33
T. 4 S., R. 102 W.,
Sec. 25

APPLICANT: Williams Northwest Pipeline

ISSUES AND CONCERNS (optional): None

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES:

Background/Introduction: An application for a Temporary Use Permit has been received which requests extra work space of 25 feet outside the granted width of 50 feet in order to repair some weakened pipe.

Proposed Action: The Ignacio/Sumas (COC011243), Piceance Creek Lateral (COC011409) and the Conoco/Dragon Trail Lines (COC45758) have segments of pipe that have weakened or failed completely. As a result of integrity testing done in 2004, Northwest Pipeline has detected areas where recoating is necessary or there are "anomalies" in the pipelines that require excavation to determine if a repair is necessary. These recoats or digs are located on existing pipelines. While the company feels that the recoating or repair will remedy the problem, there is the possibility that, at a very few locations, there will be the need to replace a section of the pipe.

The vast majority of digs will be on BLM administered land in the White River and Grand Junction areas. Most of the work will take place within Northwest's existing 50-foot right-of-way, and is authorized under the grant as routine maintenance. Northwest has requested an additional 25 feet of temporary work space on each side of the right-of-way at the specific locations noted in Attachment I (to be reclaimed back to the original right-of-way width of 50 feet).

The temporary use permit will be for one year. Construction will take place in the summer and fall months of 2005.

No Action Alternative: Under the no action alternative, the temporary use permit would not be issued and the situation would remain unchanged.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT CARRIED FORWARD: None

NEED FOR THE ACTION: This work is necessary to protect the safety of the general public and the environment.

PLAN CONFORMANCE REVIEW: The Proposed Action is subject to and has been reviewed for conformance with the following plan (43 CFR 1610.5, BLM 1617.3):

Name of Plan: White River Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan (ROD/RMP).

Date Approved: July 1, 1997

Decision Number/Page: 2-49 thru 2-52

Decision Language: "To make public lands available for the siting of public and private facilities through the issuance of applicable land use authorizations, in a manner that provides for reasonable protection of other resource values."

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT / ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES / MITIGATION MEASURES:

STANDARDS FOR PUBLIC LAND HEALTH: In January 1997, Colorado Bureau of Land Management (BLM) approved the Standards for Public Land Health. These standards cover upland soils, riparian systems, plant and animal communities, threatened and endangered species, and water quality. Standards describe conditions needed to sustain public land health and relate to all uses of the public lands. Because a standard exists for these five categories, a finding must be made for each of them in an environmental analysis. These findings are located in specific elements listed below:

CRITICAL ELEMENTS

AIR QUALITY

Affected Environment: The northernmost pipeline repairs are located approximately 7.5 miles south of Dinosaur National Monument. Dinosaur National Monument is a Class II Airshed with special designations related to visibility.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Exhaust emissions from equipment used for repairs may temporarily affect local air quality. Increased levels of fugitive dust will originate from disturbed surfaces following gusty winds and dry periods. Overall, construction operations should not greatly compromise National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) on an hourly or daily basis.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: None

Mitigation: The operator will be responsible for complying with all local, state, and federal air quality regulations as well as provide documentation to the BLM that they have done so.

All surfaces disturbed during operations will be promptly revegetated. Stockpiled soils must be covered and adequate ground cover must be applied (e.g. woody debris) to minimize surface exposure to eolian processes.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Affected Environment: except for the portions of the pipeline to be recoated in T. 1 N., R. 101 W., Section 8 all of the proposed recoat areas in Colorado have been inventoried at the Class III (100%) pedestrian level (Fetterman 2005, Compliance Dated5/18/2005) with no significant cultural resources identified in the work areas. One isolate flake was recorded which the project should easily avoid.

The portions of the pipeline to be recoated in T 1 N, R 101 W, Section 8 are near or intrude into a significant, National Register eligible site. No work may be performed in that area until adequate testing to determine the full extent of the site, what impacts, if any, the recoat project will have on the site and completion of any consultation with the Colorado SHPO has been completed.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: the proposed action has the potential to impact one site known to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic places. Buried remains are also possible in the Douglas Creek Drainage portions of the project.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: No new impacts to cultural resources are anticipated under the No Action Alternative.

Mitigation: 1. The operator is responsible for informing all persons who are associated with the project operations that they will be subject to prosecution for knowingly disturbing historic or archaeological sites, or for collecting artifacts. If historic or archaeological materials are uncovered during any project or construction activities, the operator is to immediately stop activities in the immediate area of the find that might further disturb such materials, and immediately contact the authorized officer (AO). Within five working days the AO will inform the operator as to:

- whether the materials appear eligible for the National Register of Historic Places
- the mitigation measures the operator will likely have to undertake before the site can be used (assuming in situ preservation is not necessary)
- a timeframe for the AO to complete an expedited review under 36 CFR 800-11 to confirm, through the State Historic Preservation Officer, that the findings of the AO are correct and that mitigation is appropriate.

If the operator wishes, at any time, to relocate activities to avoid the expense of mitigation and/or the delays associated with this process, the AO will assume responsibility for whatever recordation and stabilization of the exposed materials may be required. Otherwise, the operator will be responsible for mitigation cost. The AO will provide technical and procedural guidelines for the conduct of mitigation. Upon verification from the AO that the required mitigation has been completed, the operator will then be allowed to resume construction.

2. Pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(g) the holder of this authorization must notify the AO, by telephone, with written confirmation, immediately upon the discovery of human remains, funerary items, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony. Further, pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(c) and (d), you must stop activities in the vicinity of the discovery and protect it for 30 days or until notified to proceed by the authorized officer.

3. An archaeological monitor shall be required for all excavations in the Canyon Pintado National Register Historic District.

4. No work may begin on the portions of the pipeline recoat identified by Williams as CIS-02-50 and CIS -02-49 in T 1 N, R 101 W, Section 8, until such time as potential impacts to cultural site 5RB 4748 have been addressed and mitigated, as necessary.

INVASIVE, NON-NATIVE SPECIES

Affected Environment: A variety of noxious weed species are expected to occur or be of concern in the project area including; houndstongue, cheatgrass, halogeaton, black henbane, bull, musk and Canada thistles, yellow toadflax, Russian, spotted and diffuse knapweeds. All of these weeds are in the area or have been spread by vehicles and construction equipment.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: With proper reclamation and control of noxious weeds on the project sites there would not be any impacts to the adjacent native plant communities.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts.

Mitigation: The applicant/holder shall effectively control invasive, non-native species within the permit and right-of-way limits:

Application of pesticides and herbicides on public lands will conform to BLM Manual H-9011-1 and 9015.

Application of herbicides must be under field supervision of an EPA-certified pesticide applicator. Herbicides must be registered by the EPA and application proposals must be approved by the BLM.

All disturbed sites shall be promptly reclaimed to the satisfaction of the Area Manger.

Reclamation should be implemented concurrent with construction and site operations to the fullest extent possible. Final reclamation actions shall be initiated within six months of the termination of operations unless otherwise approved in writing by the Authorized Officer.

The goal for rehabilitation of any disturbed area shall be the permanent restoration of original site conditions and productive capability.

Disturbed areas shall be restored as nearly as possible to its original contour.

Fill material shall be pushed into cut areas and up over backslopes. Leave no depressions that will trap water or form ponds.

Distribute topsoil evenly over the location and prepare a seedbed by disking or ripping. Drill seed on contour at a depth no greater than ½ inch. In areas that cannot be drilled, broadcast at double the seeding rate and harrow seed into the soil.

Use seed that is certified and free of noxious weeds. Seed certification tags must be submitted to the Field Manager.

Additional seed applications may be required to accommodate specific site conditions or if initial seed germination has failed.

The permit holder will use the SCS soil survey map and range site descriptions to match the Ecological sites with the appropriate seed mix. Seed species used in reseeding disturbed areas will be based on the seed mixes identified in the following table:

Seed Mix #	Species (Variety)	Lbs. PLS per Acre	Ecological Sites
1	Western wheatgrass (Arriba) Streambank wheatgrass (Sodar) Thickspike wheatgrass (Critana) Fourwing saltbush (Wytana, Rincon) Alternates: Winterfat, shadscale, globemallow	3 2 2 2	Alkaline Slopes, Clayey Foothills, Clayey Slopes, Claypan, Mountain Shale
Seed Mix #	Species (Variety)	Lbs. PLS per Acre	Ecological Sites
2	Western wheatgrass (Rosanna) Indian ricegrass (Nezpar) Bluebunch wheatgrass (Whitmar) Thickspike wheatgrass (Critana) Green needlegrass (Lodorm) Globemallow Alternates: Fourwing saltbush, Utah sweetvetch, balsamroot	2 1 2 2 1 0.5	Deep Loam, Loamy 10"-14", Loamy Breaks, Loamy Slopes, Rolling Loam, Valley Bench
Seed Mix #	Species (Variety)	Lbs. PLS per Acre	Ecological Sites
3	Western wheatgrass (Rosanna) Bluebunch wheatgrass (Secar)	2 2 2 1	Gravelly 10"-14", Pinyon/Juniper Woodland, Stony Foothills, 147 (Mountain Mahogany)

	Thickspike wheatgrass (Critana) Indian ricegrass (Nezpar) Fourwing saltbush (Wytana) Utah sweetvetch Alternates: Needle and thread, globemallow	1 1	
Seed Mix #	Species (Variety)	Lbs. PLS per Acre	Ecological Sites
4	Western wheatgrass (Rosanna) Needle and Thread Thickspike wheatgrass (Critana) Indian ricegrass (Nezpar) Sand dropseed Alternates: Fourwing saltbush	2 2 2 2 1	Sandy Bench, Sandy Foothills, Sand Hills
Seed Mix #	Species (Variety)	Lbs. PLS per Acre	Ecological Sites
5	Basin Wildrye (Magnar) Western wheatgrass (Rosanna, Arriba) Bluebunch wheatgrass (Secar) Thickspike wheatgrass (Critana) Fourwing saltbush (Wytana) Alternates: Utah sweetvetch, globemallow	2 3 1 2 1	Foothill Swale, Sandy Swale, Swale Meadow
	Species (Variety)	Lbs. PLS per Acre	Ecological Sites
6	Bluebunch wheatgrass (Secar) Slender wheatgrass (Primar) Big Bluegrass	2 2 1 1 2	Alpine Meadow, Alpine Slopes, Aspen Woodlands, Brushy Loam, Deep clay Loam, Douglas-fir Woodland, Loamy Park, Mountain Loam, Mountain Meadows,

	(Sherman) Canby bluegrass (Canbar) Mountain brome (Bromer) Alternates: Blue flax[1/], rocky Mountain penstemon[2]/, balsamroot		Mountain Swale, Shallow Subalpine, Spruce-fir Woodland, Subalpine Loam
	Species (Variety)	Lbs. PLS per Acre	Ecological Sites
7	Thickspike wheatgrass (Critana) Slender wheatgrass (Primar) Beardless wheatgrass (Whitmar) Streambank wheatgrass (Sodor) Canby bluegrass (Canbar)	2 2 2 1 1	Dry Exposure, Dry Mountain Loam, Limestone Hills, Rocky Loam, Stony Loam

MIGRATORY BIRDS

Affected Environment: The pipeline traverses several habitat types which support a large array of migratory birds during the breeding season (May, June and July). Those sections located south of the White River/Highway 64 corridor are comprised of predominantly sagebrush habitats with perennial grass cover. This habitat typically supports species such as meadowlark and vesper sparrow and when more contiguous may support Brewer's sparrows and green-tailed towhee. At several sites young pinyon-juniper is scattered throughout or partially borders a portion of the pipeline.

Three sections immediately west of Gillam Draw and one section along School Gulch are situated in predominantly pinyon-juniper stands. Typically, species such as dusky flycatcher, rock wren, mountain bluebird, spotted towhee and pinyon jay are found in these woodlands.

Those sections along Douglas Creek/Highway 139 are located in predominantly greasewood habitat with a perennial grass cover interspersed with sagebrush. Horned lark and meadowlark are common, but generally these greasewood communities support low densities of nesting birds.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Access to the sites will be along an existing right-of-way or a highly traveled road (Highway 139). Activities associated with the sites would have no reasonable probability of adversely affecting local reproductive efforts or recruitment of migratory birds. Pipeline replacement may coincide with the later stages of nesting activity (late June – early July). However, the short time duration and small size of most segments scheduled for replacement would affect a minimal amount of habitat (1-2 ac spread

over approximately 35 miles). In addition, work is confined largely to an existing, cleared right-of-way which provides poor nesting substrate for migratory birds.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: Emergency maintenance stemming from the lack of scheduled replacement/upkeep and pipeline failure may result in more lengthy, hurriedly planned, and larger scale repairs at inopportune times (e.g., winter/early spring), which may create greater disturbance than that associated with the proposed action.

Mitigation: It is recommended that earthwork along the Douglas Creek/Highway 139 corridor is initiated prior to all other sites as this corridor typically does not support large numbers of nesting birds.

THREATENED, ENDANGERED, AND SENSITIVE ANIMAL SPECIES (includes a finding on Standard 4)

Affected Environment: A small active population of white-tailed prairie dogs is located near Gillam Draw, approximately 250 - 400 m from sections CIS-02-43 through 47, with remnant burrows scattered throughout the greasewood which, in some areas, is intersected by the pipeline. Sections CIS-03-67, 68, and 70 are located within Coal Oil Basin. This area is broadly encompassed by active prairie dog colonies.

Prairie dogs and their burrow systems are important components of burrowing owl habitat, as well as potential habitat for reintroduced populations of black-footed ferret. Burrowing owls, a State threatened species are uncommon in this Resource Area. These birds return to occupy a maintained burrow system in early April and begin nesting soon after. Most birds have left the area by September. While burrowing owls have been documented in Coal Oil Basin, no burrowing owl nesting activity has been recorded near the three sections scheduled for replacement nor in the vicinity of Gillam Draw.

Under the auspices of a non-essential, experimental population rule, black-footed ferrets have been released annually in Coyote Basin (eight miles southwest) and Wolf Creek (13 miles northeast) of Rangely Oil Field since 1999 and 2001, respectively. The rule applies to any ferrets that may occupy or eventually be released in northwest Colorado and northeast Utah. Although there is no direct continuity between Coyote Basin or Wolf Creek and the project site (i.e., lesser physical barriers and habitats unoccupied by prairie dog) there is a strong likelihood that ferrets have colonized and successfully breed in Coal Oil Basin. Ferrets are wholly reliant on prairie dogs for food and shelter. Ferret breeding activities begin in early March, with birthing beginning in early May. Young ferrets generally begin to emerge by mid-July. There have been no verified sightings of ferrets, nor any known reproduction occurring in Rangely Oil Field.

The White River corridor is the hub for seasonal bald eagle use of the lower White River Valley. Particularly during the later fall and winter months, up to several dozen bald eagles make regular foraging use of open upland communities south of the river, but these forays in search of, primarily, big game and livestock carrion and small game (e.g., rabbit and hare) are dispersed and opportunistic.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: With regards to burrowing owl, prairie dog and ferret breeding issues, it would be advantageous to schedule earthwork outside the period between 1 April and 15 July. Avoiding this timeframe would provide sufficient time for the rearing, emergence, and dispersal of young from natal burrows and effectively eliminate the likelihood of adversely affecting these animals' reproductive efforts.

This project would have no short or long term influence on prairie dog abundance or distribution by itself or as habitat for black-footed ferret or burrowing owl. It is highly unlikely that any subsurface disturbance associated with this proposed action would intersect a prairie dog burrow system occupied by a ferret.

There would be no impacts on reproductive activities of bald eagles as there are no known active nests in the vicinity of the proposed sites. The short duration of work proposed at the sites would not negatively affect foraging opportunities for bald eagles.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: Emergency maintenance stemming from the lack of scheduled replacement/upkeep and pipeline failure may result in more lengthy, hurriedly planned, and larger scale repairs at inopportune times (e.g., winter/early spring), which may create greater disturbance than that associated with the proposed action

Mitigation: All earthwork associated with those sites within or adjacent to active prairie dog colonies (CIS-02-43 through 47 and CIS-03-67, 3-68, 70) will be conducted outside the period of 1 April to15 July to avoid the remote chance of disrupting the reproductive activities of ferrets, burrowing owl, and prairie dogs.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for Threatened & Endangered species: The proposed action would have no influence on the populations or habitats of Threatened and Endangered species in the area, and thereby would have no bearing on the public land health standard.

WASTES, HAZARDOUS OR SOLID

Affected Environment: There are no known hazardous or other solid wastes on the subject lands. No hazardous materials are known to have been used, stored or disposed of at sites included in the project area.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: No listed or extremely hazardous materials in excess of threshold quantities are proposed for use in this project. While commercial preparations of fuels and lubricants proposed for use may contain some hazardous constituents, they would be stored, used and transported in a manner consistent with applicable laws, and the generation of hazardous wastes would not be anticipated. Solid wastes would be properly disposed of.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: No hazardous or other solid wastes would be generated under the no-action alternative.

Mitigation: The applicant shall be required to collect and properly dispose of any solid wastes generated by the proposed actions.

WATER QUALITY, SURFACE AND GROUND (includes a finding on Standard 5)

Affected Environment: Surface Water: The following table highlights important watershed characteristics obtained after reviewing Colorado's 1989 Nonpoint Source Assessment Report (plus updates), the 305(b) report, 303(d) list, and the White River Resource Area RMP.

Watershed	Stream Segment	Use Protected	Fragile	M&E list	303d list	Meets Water Quality Standards
Douglas Creek	23	No	Yes	Yes (sediment)	No	No (salinity/suspended sediment)
W. Douglas Creek	23	No	No	No	No	Yes
Fletcher Gulch	13a	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Gilliam Draw	13a	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Little Gilliam Draw	13a	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Piceance Creek	15	No	No	No	No	Yes
Priest Draw	13a	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Quinn Draw	13a	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
School Gulch	13a	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Spring Creek	13a	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Stinking Water Creek	22	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
White River	12	No	No	Yes (sediment)	No	No (salinity/suspended sediment/nutrients)

The State has classified stream segment 22 of the White River Basin as "Use Protected" and further designated it as beneficial for the following uses: Warm Aquatic Life 2, Recreation 1b, and Agriculture. The antidegredation review requirements in the Antidegredation Rule are not applicable to waters designated use-protected. For those waters, only the protection specified in each reach will apply. For this reach, minimum standards for four parameters have been listed. These parameters are: dissolved oxygen = 5.0 mg/l, pH = 6.5 - 9.0, Fecal Coliform = 325/100 ml, and 205/100 ml E. coli.

Stream segment 13a of the White River Basin has also been classified as "Use Protected" by the state and further designated it as beneficial for the following uses: Warm Aquatic Life 2, Recreation 2, and Agriculture. For this reach, minimum standards for four parameters have been listed. These parameters are: dissolved oxygen = 5.0 mg/l, pH = 6.5 - 9.0, Fecal Coliform = 2000/100 ml, and 630/100 ml E. coli.

Douglas Creek, Spring Creek, and Stinking Water Creek have all been identified in the White River Resource Area RMP as “fragile” watersheds. This designation relates to the lack of stream

bank stability and the water shed's high vulnerability to gully formation, head cutting, and mass-wasting.

Ground Water: Portions of the proposed pipeline repair are located in either ground water recharge areas or near ground water discharge areas (near streams). Based on the location of the proposed actions, local ground water may be affected by digging activities and spills/leaks of environmentally unfriendly substances.

Several BLM springs are located near proposed pipeline repairs. However, none of these springs are located within 50 meters of any disturbance associated with the proposed actions.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Removal of ground cover associated with pipeline repairs will leave soils exposed to erosional processes such as raindrop impact and overland flows. Portions of the pipeline located within areas of local groundwater recharge may disrupt ground water flow if any confining layers are ruptured during repairs. In addition, use of heavy equipment near stream banks may compromise stream bank stability.

Adverse environmental effects on the identified springs would have taken place when the original line was first constructed. Thus, detrimental effects due to additional work within the proposed right of way are not anticipated in the absence of leaks or spills.

Saline concentrations in surface waters will be elevated as salts are dissolved from saline soils and transported to stream channels.

In the event of any leaks or spills of environmentally unfriendly substances, local ground water will be susceptible to contamination. Furthermore, surface water bodies (e.g. White River) will be vulnerable to contamination if leaks or spills are allowed to directly contact surface waters or infiltrated alluvium.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: Pipeline repairs would not take place. The risk of pipeline failure in specified locations would remain high. Potential for contaminating ground and surface waters will increase as pipeline integrity deteriorates with time.

Mitigation: The operator will be responsible for complying with all local, state, and federal water quality regulations as well as provide documentation to the BLM that they have done so. Portions of the affected area are listed as saline soils. These locations will require an engineered construction/reclamation plan approved by the Area Manager. In addition, the operator will be required to monitor salt concentrations in surface waters downstream of repairs crossing saline soils.

To mitigate surface erosion due to removal of ground cover, stockpiled soils must be covered and silt fences will be used on down gradient sides. Upon reclamation flow deflectors and sediment traps (woody debris) must be redistributed over the affected area along with Native Seed Mix #1 or #3 (depending on the affected range site). In repair of existing pipelines, proper drainage structures (drain dips) must be installed to reduce surface erosion and minimize

sediment contributions to stream channels. Any pre-existing drainage problems encountered during pipeline repairs will be assessed and properly mitigated (e.g. head cuts will be back-sloped to acquire a maximum grade of 10:1).

To mitigate contamination of local ground water, environmentally unfriendly substances (e.g. diesel) must not be allowed to contact soils. The use of impermeable matting under equipment will be required to intercept contaminants prior to contacting soils at locations within 200 feet of any water body.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for water quality: Stream segments 12 and 23 of the Whit River Basin have been identified as not meeting water quality standards set by the state of Colorado. The proposed actions may temporarily increase sediment loads and elevate salt concentrations to all affected stream segments. However, potential consequences of the no action alternative pose greater long term environmental threat than the proposed actions. By strictly following mitigation measures outlined above, water quality should not be significantly compromised by the proposed actions.

WETLANDS AND RIPARIAN ZONES (includes a finding on Standard 2)

Affected Environment: Within the White River Field Office the pipeline repairs are within the East, West and Main Stem Douglas Creek, White River and Piceance Creek. All of these streams are perennial and are considered in proper functioning condition. All of these streams are dependant on riparian vegetation for channel stability.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: There will be one patch west of West Douglas Creek that will not impact the riparian zone either directly or indirectly. There will be patches on both sides of East Douglas Creek, construction will not be within the riparian zone and should not adversely affect the stability of this system. Several patches are proposed on the uplands above Main Stem Douglas creek (west side) and the White River (south side) and would not affect these stream systems. A patch is proposed along Piceance Creek with the actual disturbance well outside of the riparian system and as such no adverse impacts are expected.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: Emergency maintenance stemming from the lack of scheduled replacement/upkeep and pipeline failure may result in more lengthy, hurriedly planned, and larger scale repairs at inopportune times (e.g., winter/early spring), which may create greater disturbance than that associated with the proposed action.

Mitigation: None

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for riparian systems: The Douglas Creek complex is generally meeting the standard for riparian communities and the system continues to improve (i.e., channel aggradation and wetland/riparian obligate expression). This project would have no negative impacts on riparian vegetation or channel function. Subsequently the project would have no effect on continued achievement of the public land health standard for riparian systems.

CRITICAL ELEMENTS NOT PRESENT OR NOT AFFECTED:

No ACEC's, flood plains, prime and unique farmlands, or Wild and Scenic Rivers, threatened, endangered or sensitive plants exist within the area affected by the proposed action. For threatened, endangered and sensitive plant species Public Land Health Standard is not applicable since neither the proposed nor the no-action alternative would have any influence on populations of, or habitats potentially occupied by, special status plants. There are also no Native American religious or environmental justice concerns associated with the proposed action.

NON-CRITICAL ELEMENTS

The following elements **must** be addressed due to the involvement of Standards for Public Land Health:

SOILS (includes a finding on Standard 1)

Affected Environment: Fragile soils have been mapped through a significant portion of the proposed pipeline repair. However, after observing a topographic map it was concluded that no surface disturbing activities will occur on slopes exceeding 35%. Thus, controlled surface use stipulations are not applicable to these locations.

Saline soils requiring controlled surface use stipulations will be encountered at the following sites:

Sites Encountering CSU-1 Saline Soils	
CIS-03-58	AS-04-52
CIS-03-61	AS-04-53
CIS-03-62	AS-04-54
CIS-03-63	
CIS-03-64	
CIS-03-65	
CIS-03-66	
CIS-03-70	
CIS-03-71	
CIS-03-72	

At the sites listed above, surface disturbing activities will be permitted only after an engineered construction/reclamation plan is submitted by the operator and approved by the Field Manager.

The following data is a product of an order III soil survey conducted by the NRCS. The accompanying table highlights important soil characteristics. A complete summary of this information can be found at the White River Field Office.

Soil Number	Soil Name	Slope	Ecological site	Salinity	Run Off	Erosion Potential	Bedrock
1	Abor Clay Loam	5-30%	Clayey Foothills	<4	Rapid	High	20-40
7	Billings silty clay loam	0-5%	Alkaline Slopes	2-8	Rapid	Moderate to high	>60
16	Chipeta silty clay loam	3-25%	Clayey Salt-desert	4-16	Rapid	High	10-20
18	Chipeta-Killpack silty clay loam	3-15%	Clayey Salt-desert	4-16	Rapid	High	10-20
21	Cliffdown-Cliffdown Variant complex	5-65%	Salt-desert Breaks	<2	Medium to slow	Slight to moderate	>60
40	Hagga loam		Swale Meadow	2-8	Slow	Slight	>60
46	Kinnear fine sandy loam	1-5%	Loamy Salt-desert	<4	Medium	Slight	>60
47	Kobar silty clay loam	0-3%	Deep Clay Loam	<2	Medium	Slight	>60
53	Moyerson stony clay loam	15-65%	Clayey Slopes	2-4	Rapid	Very high	10-20
55	Nihill channery sandy loam	5-50%	Salt-desert Breaks	<2	Medium	Moderate to very high	>60
74	Rentsac-Moyerson -Rock Outcrop complex	5-65%	PJ Woodlands /Clayey Slopes	<2	Medium	Moderate to very high	10-20
78	Rock Outcrop	50-100%	None		Very high	Slight	0
89	Tisworth fine sandy loam	0-5%	Alkaline Slopes	>4	Rapid	Moderate	>60
90	Torrifluvents, gullied		None		Rapid	Very high	>60
91	Torriorthents-Rock Outcrop complex	15-90%	Stoney Foothills		Rapid	Very high	10-20
94	Turley fine sandy loam	3-8%	Alkaline Slopes	2-4	Medium	Slight to moderate	>60

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Removal of limited ground cover will expose soils to erosional processes. The use of heavy equipment will increase soil compaction decreasing infiltration rates which in turn will increase erosive potential of raindrop impact and overland flows.

At locations saline soils are encountered, piping and rill formation will occur as a result of improper drainage and dissolution of salts from saline soils.

Leaks or spills of environmentally unfriendly substances may contaminate soils hindering revegetation efforts. Soils unable to support a healthy plant community will be less cohesive (due to lack of root structure) and more vulnerable to erosional processes.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: Pipeline repairs would not take place. The risk of pipeline failure in specified locations would remain high. Potential for contaminating soils will increase as pipeline integrity deteriorates with time.

Mitigation: Portions of the affected area are in "saline" soils. These locations will require an engineered construction/reclamation plan approved by the Field Manager.

To mitigate surface erosion due to removal of ground cover, stockpiled soils must be covered and silt fences will be used on down gradient sides. Upon reclamation flow deflectors and sediment traps (woody debris) must be redistributed over the affected area along with Native Seed Mix #1 or #3 (depending on the affected rang site). In repair of existing pipelines, proper drainage structures (drain dips) must be installed to reduce surface erosion and minimize sediment contributions to stream channels. Any pre-existing drainage problems encountered during pipeline repairs will be assessed and properly mitigated (e.g. head cuts will be back-sloped to acquire a maximum grade of 10:1).

To mitigate contamination of local ground water, environmentally unfriendly substances (e.g. diesel) must not be allowed to contact soils. The use of impermeable matting under equipment will be required to intercept contaminants prior to contacting soils at locations within 200 feet of any water body.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for upland soils: CSU-1 "saline" soils will be encountered across significant portion of the proposed action. Following pipeline repairs, vegetal cover will be reduced and soils exposed. As a result, infiltration and permeability rates will slightly decrease resulting in more overland flows. However, by following proper mitigation techniques, soil health should not be adversely affected.

VEGETATION (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: The project area goes through a number of ecological sites as described in the above soil description. These plant communities have been modified by the original construction of the pipeline and bare little resemblance to the climax communities.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The majority of disturbance associated with this project will be on previously disturbed plant communities. Following reclamation there would be stabilization of soils and the opportunity for the native plant communities to encroach on the project site.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts.

Mitigation: No additional mitigation required.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Wildlife, Aquatic and Wildlife, Terrestrial)*:*
There would be no change in plant community from the current situation. The current plant communities are a result of reclamation and function appropriately to stabilize soils.

WILDLIFE, AQUATIC (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: Aquatic habitat along the West Douglas and main Douglas Creeks are confined to the channel incise. Perennial reaches of the West Douglas and mainstem Douglas channels are known only to support small numbers of speckled dace, an abundant and widely distributed nongame species. Beaver have intermittently colonized Douglas Creek, as well as a small portion of West Douglas Creek near Sand Draw. These beaver ponds and their lengthy backwaters are exploited by small, but well distributed breeding populations of mallard, green-winged teal, and spotted sandpiper.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: There would be minimal negative impacts at the proposed sites along the West Douglas and mainstem Douglas channels as all work is scheduled to take place outside the channel incise.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: : Emergency maintenance stemming from the lack of scheduled replacement/upkeep and pipeline failure may result in more lengthy, hurriedly planned, and larger scale repairs at inopportune times (e.g., winter/early spring), which may create greater disturbance than that associated with the proposed action.

Mitigation: None

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Vegetation and Wildlife, Terrestrial): The Douglas Creek complex generally meets the standard for animal communities and the system continues to improve (i.e., channel aggradation and wetland/riparian obligate expression). This project would have no negative impacts on aquatic wildlife or their habitats. Subsequently the project would have no effect on continued achievement of the public land health standard for aquatic wildlife or their habitats.

WILDLIFE, TERRESTRIAL (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: The majority of the habitat along the pipeline corridor constitutes general winter range for deer and elk. The sites which lie along the White River corridor are located within severe winter range for both deer and elk. Winter ranges are generally occupied by big game from mid-October through mid-April.

The three sections west of Gillam Draw and along School Gulch are situated within or adjacent to pinyon-juniper woodlands, all of which have the potential to support nesting raptors. The woodland areas immediately adjacent to the Highway 139 corridor provide poor nesting substrate for raptors, which decreases the likelihood of nesting. Rim rock upland/outcrops along the corridor exhibit high raptor nesting potential and are near enough to be influenced by disturbance. However, no evidence of use was observed.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: There would be little if any impact on deer and elk habitat along the pipeline corridor. Pipeline replacement/recoating is expected to occur during the summer and fall months thereby having no negative impacts on

winter use by deer and elk. Although maintenance activity would remove shrub growth as a potential source of big game winter forage, these sites would be small (average 0.25 acre) and widely separated along the 35 mile pipeline corridor. Although reestablishment of shrub growth may require a decade or more, total involvement would be less than 5 acres—wholly discountable in the context of the remaining woody forage base on these winter ranges.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: Emergency maintenance stemming from the lack of scheduled replacement/upkeep and pipeline failure may result in more lengthy, hurriedly planned, and larger scale repairs at inopportune times (e.g., winter/early spring), which may create greater disturbance than that associated with the proposed action.

Mitigation: It is recommended that all earthwork associated with sites that occur in or adjacent to pinyon-juniper woodlands (CIS-03-57, CIS-02-48, 49, and 50) begin after 15 July in an effort to avoid nesting raptors.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Vegetation and Wildlife, Aquatic): Upland habitats encompassing the project area generally meet the land health standards for animal communities. The proposed action would have no measurable long-term influence on the condition or utility of terrestrial wildlife or their habitats. Subsequently, the proposed action as mitigated, would not detract from the indicators comprising the land health standard for animal communities.

OTHER NON-CRITICAL ELEMENTS: For the following elements, only those brought forward for analysis will be addressed further.

Non-Critical Element	NA or Not Present	Applicable or Present, No Impact	Applicable & Present and Brought Forward for Analysis
Access and Transportation		X	
Cadastral Survey	X		
Fire Management	X		
Forest Management	X		
Geology and Minerals	X		
Hydrology/Water Rights		X	
Law Enforcement		X	
Noise	X		
Paleontology			X
Rangeland Management		X	
Realty Authorizations		X	
Recreation		X	
Socio-Economics		X	
Visual Resources		X	
Wild Horses	X		

PALEONTOLOGY

Affected Environment: The proposed temporary work areas and the pipeline recoating project is located in areas where the Douglas Creek member of the Green River, Mesa Verde, Uinta and Wasatch formations either outcrop or are shallowly buried (Tweto 1979). The Douglas Creek formation is classified as a Conditions II formation at the present time, meaning the full fossil bearing potential of the formation is not fully understood at this time but, it does produce fossils. The remaining formations are classified as Condition I formations meaning that they are known to produce scientifically significant fossil resources on a regular basis.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: If it becomes necessary to excavate into the underlying rock at any time to access the pipeline to apply the protective coating there is a potential to impact scientifically important fossil resources.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no new impacts to fossil resources under the No Action Alternative.

Mitigation: 1. The operator is responsible for informing all persons who are associated with the project operations that they will be subject to prosecution for knowingly disturbing paleontological sites, or for collecting fossils. If fossil materials are uncovered during any project or construction activities, the operator is to immediately stop activities in the immediate area of the find that might further disturb such materials, and immediately contact the authorized officer (AO). Within five working days the AO will inform the operator as to:

- whether the materials appear to be of noteworthy scientific interest
- the mitigation measures the operator will likely have to undertake before the site can be used (assuming in situ preservation is not feasible)

If the operator wishes, at any time, to relocate activities to avoid the expense of mitigation and/or the delays associated with this process, the AO will assume responsibility for whatever recordation and stabilization of the exposed materials may be required. Otherwise, the operator will be responsible for mitigation cost. The AO will provide technical and procedural guidelines for the conduct of mitigation. Upon verification from the AO that the required mitigation has been completed, the operator will then be allowed to resume construction.

2. A monitor shall be required anytime it becomes necessary to excavate into the underlying rock formations in order to provide access those portions of the pipeline that need to be recoated with protective coatings.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS SUMMARY: This action is consistent with the scope of impacts addressed in the White River ROD/RMP. The cumulative impacts of oil and gas activities are addressed in the White River ROD/RMP for each resource value that would be affected by the proposed action.

REFERENCES CITED:

Fetterman, Jerry
2005 Cultural Resource Inventory of Vernal 2005 Recoat Locaions for Williams Gas Pipelines West, Rio Blanco County, Colorado. Woods Canyon Archaeological Consultants, Inc., Yellow Jacket, Colorado

Tweto, Ogden
1979 Geologic Map of Colorado. United States Geologic Survey, Department of the Interior, Reston, Virginia.

PERSONS / AGENCIES CONSULTED:

INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW:

Name	Title	Area of Responsibility
Nate Dieterich	Hydrologist	Air Quality
Tamara Meagley	Natural Resource Specialist	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern
Tamara Meagley	Natural Resource Specialist	Threatened and Endangered Plant Species
Michael Selle	Archeologist	Cultural Resources Paleontological Resources
Robert Fowler	Rangeland Management Specialist	Invasive, Non-Native Species
Lisa Belmonte	Wildlife Biologist	Migratory Birds
Lisa Blemonte	Wildlife Biologist	Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Animal Species, Wildlife
Bo Brown	Petroleum Engineer Tech/Hazmat Collateral	Wastes, Hazardous or Solid
Nate Dieterich	Hydrologist	Water Quality, Surface and Ground Hydrology and Water Rights
Robert Fowler	Forester	Wetlands and Riparian Zones
Chris Ham	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Wilderness
Nate Dieterich	Hydrologist	Soils
Robert Fowler	Rangeland Management Specialist	Vegetation
Lisa Belmonte	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife Terrestrial and Aquatic
Chris Ham	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Access and Transportation
Ken Holsinger	Natural Resource Specialist	Fire Management
Robert Fowler	Forester	Forest Management
Paul Daggett	Mining Engineer	Geology and Minerals
Robert Fowler	Rangeland Management Specialist	Rangeland Management
Penny Brown	Realty Specialist	Realty Authorizations
Chris Ham	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation
Keith Whitaker	Natural Resource Specialist	Visual Resources
Valerie Dobrich	Natural Resource Specialist	Wild Horses

Finding of No Significant Impact/Decision Record (FONSI/DR)

CO-110-2005-139-EA

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)/RATIONALE: The environmental assessment and analyzing the environmental effects of the proposed action have been reviewed. The approved mitigation measures (listed below) result in a Finding of No Significant Impact on the human environment. Therefore, an environmental impact statement is not necessary to further analyze the environmental effects of the proposed action.

DECISION/RATIONALE: It is my decision to issue Temporary Use Permit COC68671 to Williams Northwest Pipeline, for temporary work space needed for the maintenance of pipelines authorized under rights-of-way COC011243, COC011409, and COC45758, as proposed and subject to the mitigation measures listed below. The additional workspace is limited to 25 feet each side of the existing right-of-way at the specific locations listed in Attachment I. This TUP will be issued under the authority of Section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended, for a term of three years. Payment of fair market rental will be required

MITIGATION MEASURES:

1. The operator will be responsible for complying with all local, state, and federal air quality regulations as well as provide documentation to the BLM that they have done so.

2. All surfaces disturbed during operations will be promptly revegetated. Stockpiled soils must be covered and adequate ground cover must be applied (e.g. woody debris) to minimize surface exposure to eolian processes.

3. The applicant shall be required to collect and properly dispose of any solid wastes generated by the proposed action.

4. The operator will be responsible for complying with all local, state, and federal water quality regulations as well as provide documentation to the BLM that they have done so. Portions of the affected area are listed as saline soils. These locations will require an engineered construction/reclamation plan approved by the Field Manager. In addition, the operator will be required to monitor salt concentrations in surface waters downstream of repairs crossing identified "saline" soils.

5. To mitigate surface erosion due to removal of ground cover, stockpiled soils must be covered and silt fences will be used on down gradient sides. Upon reclamation flow deflectors and sediment traps (woody debris) must be redistributed over the affected area along with Native Seed Mix #1 or #3 (depending on the affected rang site). In repair of existing pipelines, proper drainage structures (drain dips) must be installed to reduce surface erosion and minimize sediment contributions to stream channels. Any pre-existing drainage problems encountered

during pipeline repairs will be assessed and properly mitigated (e.g. head cuts will be back-sloped to acquire a maximum grade of 10:1).

6. To mitigate contamination of local ground water, environmentally unfriendly substances (e.g. diesel) must not be allowed to contact soils. The use of impermeable matting under equipment will be required to intercept contaminants prior to contacting soils at locations within 200 feet of any water body.

7. Application of pesticides and herbicides on public lands will conform to BLM Manual H-9011-1 and 9015.

8. Application of herbicides must be under field supervision of an EPA-certified pesticide applicator. Herbicides must be registered by the EPA and application proposals must be approved by the BLM.

9. All disturbed sites shall be promptly reclaimed to the satisfaction of the Area Manger.

10. Reclamation should be implemented concurrent with construction and site operations to the fullest extent possible. Final reclamation actions shall be initiated within six months of the termination of operations unless otherwise approved in writing by the Authorized Officer.

11. The goal for rehabilitation of any disturbed area shall be the permanent restoration of original site conditions and productive capability.

12. Disturbed areas shall be restored as nearly as possible to its original contour.

13. Fill material shall be pushed into cut areas and up over backslopes. Leave no depressions that will trap water or form ponds.

14. Distribute topsoil evenly over the location and prepare a seedbed by disking or ripping. Drill seed on contour at a depth no greater than ½ inch. In areas that cannot be drilled, broadcast at double the seeding rate and harrow seed into the soil.

15. Use seed that is certified and free of noxious weeds. Seed certification tags must be submitted to the Field Manager.

16. Additional seed applications may be required to accommodate specific site conditions or if initial seed germination has failed.

17. The permit holder will use the SCS soil survey map and range site descriptions to match the Ecological sites with the appropriate seed mix. Seed species used in reseeding disturbed areas will be based on the seed mixes identified in the following table:

Seed Mix #	Species (Variety)	Lbs. PLS per Acre	Ecological Sites
1	Western wheatgrass (Arriba) Streambank wheatgrass (Sodar) Thickspike wheatgrass (Critana) Fourwing saltbush (Wytana, Rincon) Alternates: Winterfat, shadscale, globemallow	3 2 2 2	Alkaline Slopes, Clayey Foothills, Clayey Slopes, Claypan, Mountain Shale
Seed Mix #	Species (Variety)	Lbs. PLS per Acre	Ecological Sites
2	Western wheatgrass (Rosanna) Indian ricegrass (Nezpar) Bluebunch wheatgrass (Whitmar) Thickspike wheatgrass (Critana) Green needlegrass (Lodorm) Globemallow Alternates: Fourwing saltbush, Utah sweetvetch, balsamroot	2 1 2 2 1 0.5	Deep Loam, Loamy 10"-14", Loamy Breaks, Loamy Slopes, Rolling Loam, Valley Bench
Seed Mix #	Species (Variety)	Lbs. PLS per Acre	Ecological Sites
3	Western wheatgrass (Rosanna) Bluebunch wheatgrass (Secar) Thickspike wheatgrass (Critana) Indian ricegrass (Nezpar) Fourwing saltbush (Wytana) Utah sweetvetch Alternates: Needle and	2 2 2 1 1 1	Gravelly 10"-14", Pinyon/Juniper Woodland, Stony Foothills, 147 (Mountain Mahogany)

	thread, globemallow		
Seed Mix #	Species (Variety)	Lbs. PLS per Acre	Ecological Sites
4	Western wheatgrass (Rosanna) Needle and Thread Thickspike wheatgrass (Critana) Indian ricegrass (Nezpar) Sand dropseed Alternates: Fourwing saltbush	2 2 2 2 1	Sandy Bench, Sandy Foothills, Sand Hills
Seed Mix #	Species (Variety)	Lbs. PLS per Acre	Ecological Sites
5	Basin Wildrye (Magnar) Western wheatgrass (Rosanna, Arriba) Bluebunch wheatgrass (Secar) Thickspike wheatgrass (Critana) Fourwing saltbush (Wytana) Alternates: Utah sweetvetch, globemallow	2 3 1 2 1	Foothill Swale, Sandy Swale, Swale Meadow
	Species (Variety)	Lbs. PLS per Acre	Ecological Sites
6	Bluebunch wheatgrass (Secar) Slender wheatgrass (Primar) Big Bluegrass (Sherman) Canby bluegrass (Canbar) Mountain brome (Bromer) Alternates: Blue flax[1/], rocky Mountain penstemon[2]/, balsamroot	2 2 1 1 2	Alpine Meadow, Alpine Slopes, Aspen Woodlands, Brushy Loam, Deep clay Loam, Douglas-fir Woodland, Loamy Park, Mountain Loam, Mountain Meadows, Mountain Swale, Shallow Subalpine, Spruce-fir Woodland, Subalpine Loam

	Species (Variety)	Lbs. PLS per Acre	Ecological Sites
7	Thickspike wheatgrass (Critana) Slender wheatgrass (Primar) Beardless wheatgrass (Whitmar) Streambank wheatgrass (Sodor) Canby bluegrass (Canbar)	2 2 2 1 1	Dry Exposure, Dry Mountain Loam, Limestone Hills, Rocky Loam, Stony Loam

18. It is recommended that earthwork along the Douglas Creek/Highway 139 corridor is initiated prior to all other sites as this corridor typically does not support large numbers of nesting birds.

19. All earthwork associated with those sites within or adjacent to active prairie dog colonies (CIS-02-43 through 47 and CIS-03-67, 3-68, 70) will be conducted outside the period of April 1 to July 15 to avoid the remote chance of disrupting the reproductive activities of ferrets, burrowing owl, and prairie dogs.

20. It is recommended that all earthwork associated with sites that occur in or adjacent to pinyon-juniper woodlands (CIS-03-57, CIS-02-48, 49, and 50) begin after 15 July in an effort to avoid nesting raptors.

21. The operator is responsible for informing all persons who are associated with the project operations that they will be subject to prosecution for knowingly disturbing paleontological sites, or for collecting fossils. If fossil materials are uncovered during any project or construction activities, the operator is to immediately stop activities in the immediate area of the find that might further disturb such materials, and immediately contact the authorized officer (AO). Within five working days the AO will inform the operator as to:

- whether the materials appear to be of noteworthy scientific interest
- the mitigation measures the operator will likely have to undertake before the site can be used (assuming in situ preservation is not feasible)

22. If the operator wishes, at any time, to relocate activities to avoid the expense of mitigation and/or the delays associated with this process, the AO will assume responsibility for whatever recordation and stabilization of the exposed materials may be required. Otherwise, the operator will be responsible for mitigation cost. The AO will provide technical and procedural guidelines for the conduct of mitigation. Upon verification from the AO that the required mitigation has been completed, the operator will then be allowed to resume construction.

23. A paleontological monitor shall be required anytime it becomes necessary to excavate into the underlying rock formations in order to provide access those portions of the pipeline that need to be recoated with protective coatings.

24. The operator is responsible for informing all persons who are associated with the project operations that they will be subject to prosecution for knowingly disturbing historic or archaeological sites, or for collecting artifacts. If historic or archaeological materials are uncovered during any project or construction activities, the operator is to immediately stop activities in the immediate area of the find that might further disturb such materials, and immediately contact the authorized officer (AO). Within five working days the AO will inform the operator as to:

- whether the materials appear eligible for the National Register of Historic Places

- the mitigation measures the operator will likely have to undertake before the site can be used (assuming in situ preservation is not necessary)

- a timeframe for the AO to complete an expedited review under 36 CFR 800-11 to confirm, through the State Historic Preservation Officer, that the findings of the AO are correct and that mitigation is appropriate.

25. If the operator wishes, at any time, to relocate activities to avoid the expense of mitigation and/or the delays associated with this process, the AO will assume responsibility for whatever recordation and stabilization of the exposed materials may be required. Otherwise, the operator will be responsible for mitigation cost. The AO will provide technical and procedural guidelines for the conduct of mitigation. Upon verification from the AO that the required mitigation has been completed, the operator will then be allowed to resume construction.

26. Pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(g) the holder of this authorization must notify the AO, by telephone, with written confirmation, immediately upon the discovery of human remains, funerary items, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony. Further, pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(c) and (d), you must stop activities in the vicinity of the discovery and protect it for 30 days or until notified to proceed by the authorized officer.

27. An archaeological monitor shall be required for all excavations in the Canyon Pintado National Register Historic District.

28. No work may begin on the portions of the pipeline recoat identified by Williams as CIS-02-50 and CIS -02-49 in T 1 N, R 101 W, Section 8, until such time as potential impacts to cultural site 5RB 4748 have been addressed and mitigated, as necessary.

COMPLIANCE/MONITORING: Compliance will be conducted by the realty staff at least every five years.

NAME OF PREPARER: Penny Brown

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR: Vern Rholl VR

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL: Kent C. Walter
Field Manager

DATE SIGNED: 6/30/05

ATTACHMENTS: CO-110-2005-139-EA; Attachment1

CO-110-2005-139-EA 28